



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/442,517 11/18/99 RUST

D 246/211

022249
LYON & LYON LLP
SUITE 4700
633 WEST FIFTH STREET
LOS ANGELES CA 90071-2066

TM02/0321

EXAMINER

MEKY, M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2153

DATE MAILED:

03/21/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/442,517

Applicant
David Bradley Rust

Examiner
Moustafa Meky

Group Art Unit
2153



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Nov 18, 1999

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 2

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2153

1. Claims 1-16 are presenting for examination.
2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 5-7, 9-13, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) & (e) as being anticipated by Yamamoto (US Pat. No. 5,991,276).

4. As to claims 1-2, and 5-6, Yamamoto shows in Figs 1-3, 11-13, 15, a computer system including a first computer 2a, a control site computer 3a, and a second computer 2b are coupled together through a computer network I. Yamamoto teaches a first computer 2a would select a region on its display to be transmitted to a control site 3a and thereafter being transmitted by the control site computer 3a to a second computer 2b to be displayed on its display, see col 1, lines

Art Unit: 2153

64-67, col 2, lines 1-7, col 3, lines 1-11, lines 44-56, col 7, lines 36-67, col 8, lines 20-63, col 11, lines 23-45, lines 64-67, col 12, lines 1-46, col 13, lines 40-51.

5. As to claims 7, 9-13, and 16, the claims are similar in scope to claims 1-2, and 5-6, and they are rejected under the same rationale.

Therefore, it can be seen from paragraphs 4-5 that Yamamoto anticipates claims 1-2, 5-7, 9-13, and 16.

6. Claims 3-4, 8, and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto (US Pat. No. 5,991,276).

7. As to claims 3-4, Yamamoto shows in Figs 1-3, 11-13, 15, a computer system including a first computer 2a, a control site computer 3a, and a second computer 2b are coupled together through a computer network I as been discussed in paragraph 4 above. However, Yamamoto does not use the Internet as a medium to transfer the data (he used an ATM Network). The use of the Internet to establish a conference was well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Yamamoto to be implemented using the Internet in order to enable remote computers to collaborate at large distance.

8. As to claims 8, and 14-15, the claims are similar in scope to claims 3-4, and they are rejected under the same rationale.

Therefore, it be seen from paragraphs 7-8 that the modified system of Yamamoto teaches the limitations of claims 3-4, 8, and 14-15.

Art Unit: 2153

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Moustafa M. Meky whose telephone number is (703) 305-9697.

The examiner can normally be reached on week days from 7:30 am to 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess, can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-9051.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 305-305-7201 (for informal or draft communications, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA.,

Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

M.M.M

March 17, 20001


MOUSTAFA M. MEKY
PRIMARY EXAMINER